

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 5, 2006, and within the three month period for reply extending to September 5, 2006. The current status of the claims is summarized below.

5 Claims 1, 9, and 18 are currently amended.

 Claims 1-20 are pending following entry of this Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

 Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11-14, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as
10 being anticipated by Umesh et al. ("Umesh" hereafter) (U.S. Patent Application
Publication No. 2004/0137952 A1). These rejections are traversed.

 Umesh discloses a system for avoiding disconnection of a radio link between a
radio base station and a mobile station. In the system of Umesh, a timer is used to
monitor a signal interval, i.e., an amount of time, that has elapsed since a last
15 communication from the mobile station to the base station. If the signal interval exceeds a
timer threshold, the antenna at the base station is controlled to expand a width of the
directional beam pattern previously used to communicate with the mobile station. Thus,
the expansion of the directional beam pattern generated by the base station is intended to
enable communication with the mobile station in the event that the mobile station has
20 moved since its last transmission to the base station.

 It should be understood that the expansion of the directional beam pattern
generated by the base station in response to the timer exceeding the timer threshold
represents a modification of a direction beam shape transmitted by the antenna of the base
station. It should be further understood that the expansion of the directional beam pattern
25 generated by the base station in response to the timer exceeding the timer threshold does

not imply transmission of any particular content in the expanded direction beam. Simply stated, Umesh teaches modification of spatial properties of a direction beam and does teach a particular type of signal content or modification thereof transmitted via the directional beam.

5 Claim 1 recites alignment circuitry configured to generate and transmit an alignment signal to a target transceiver in response to receipt of the output signal from the comparator. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the alignment signal represents a dword to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver. As discussed above, Umesh does not teach a particular type of signal content or transmission thereof. Thus,
10 the Applicants submit that Umesh does not teach the alignment circuitry of claim 1. Specifically, Umesh does not teach the alignment circuitry configured to generate and transmit an alignment signal, wherein the alignment signal represents a dword to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver.

 For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, each and every feature of the
15 claim must be taught by a single prior art reference. As discussed above, Umesh does not teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Umesh, and is in fact patentable over the cited art of record. The Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

 Claim 9 has been amended to clarify that the alignment signal represents a dword
20 to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Umesh does not teach a particular type of signal content or transmission thereof. Specifically, Umesh does not teach transmission of an alignment signal representing a dword to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver. Therefore, the Applicants submit that amended claim 9 is not anticipated by Umesh, as Umesh does

not teach each and every feature of claim 9. The Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 9.

As with claim 9, claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the alignment signal represents a dword to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9, Umesh does not teach a particular type of signal content or transmission thereof. Specifically, Umesh does not teach transmission of an alignment signal representing a dword to be ignored by internal logic of the target transceiver. Therefore, the Applicants submit that amended claim 18 is not anticipated by Umesh, as Umesh does not teach each and every feature of claim 18. The Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 18.

Because a dependent claim incorporates each and every feature of the independent claim from which it depends, each of dependent claims 2-8, 10-17, and 19-20 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above for its respective independent claim. Therefore, the Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 11-14, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2, 10, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umesh. These rejections are traversed.

Because a dependent claim incorporates each and every feature of the independent claim from which it depends, each of dependent claims 2-8, 10-17, and 19-20 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above for its respective independent claim. Therefore, the Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 2, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Additionally, the Applicants note that the Office has relied upon Official Notice to reject each of dependent claims 2, 10, and 19. All such reliance on Official Notice is hereby traversed. The Office has asserted that a user interface for setting the alignment trigger value is commonly known in the art. However, the Applicants submit that such a user interface for setting the alignment trigger value in combination with the features of independent claims 1, 9, and 18, respectively, is not commonly known in the art. Therefore, the Office must provide documentary evidence supporting its rejections of claims 2, 10, and 19, or withdraw the rejections.

Claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umesh in view of Martin et al. ("Martin" hereafter) (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0089012). These rejections are traversed.

Because a dependent claim incorporates each and every feature of the independent claim from which it depends, each of dependent claims 2-8, 10-17, and 19-20 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above for its respective independent claim. Therefore, the Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umesh in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are traversed.

Because a dependent claim incorporates each and every feature of the independent claim from which it depends, each of dependent claims 2-8, 10-17, and 19-20 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above for its respective independent claim. Therefore, the Office is kindly requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Additionally, the Applicants note that the Office has relied upon Official Notice to reject each of dependent claims 7, 8, 16, and 17. All such reliance on Official Notice is hereby traversed. With regard to claims 7 and 16, the Office has asserted that SAS and SATA protocols are commonly known in the art. However, the Applicants submit that an electronic communication process using SAS and SATA protocols in combination with the features of independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, is not commonly known in the art. Therefore, the Office must provide documentary evidence supporting its rejections of claims 7 and 16, or withdraw the rejections.

With regard to claims 8 and 17, the Office has asserted that a transceiver defined as a PHY is commonly known in the art. However, the Applicants submit that definition of the initiator transceiver and target transceiver as phys in combination with the features of independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, is not commonly known in the art. Therefore, the Office must provide documentary evidence supporting its rejections of claims 8 and 17, or withdraw the rejections.

The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6914. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP271). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Kenneth D. Wright
Reg. No. 53,795

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 25,920